

**Park, Recreation and Open Space Advisory Committee Meeting (PROSAC)  
January 10, 2017**

**Chair:** Welcome to the January of the Park, Recreation, Open Space Advisory Committee. I am thankful you all made it through the harrowing weather. Those of you who have lived in San Francisco for a long remember these days where it was forty days straight of rain. I miss those days until we are going to have those again. I am happy that you made it. I believe there is going to be some different faces so I will dedicate the Chair's report probably tonight to introducing our first new member. For those of you who don't know there are a few other members who termed out, they will be back to visit but are no longer on this committee. So they will probably be replaced within the next month of two. Again, be ready to see some new faces on PROSAC.

I would like to start with a roll call, beginning on my left.

**Richard Rothman:** District 1, first vice Chair.

**Maya Rodgers:** District 10, second vice Chair.

**Jordyn Aquino:** District 4.

**Kim Hirschfield:** District 3.

**Winnie Chu:** District 7.

**Jane Weil:** District 6.

**Ana Gee:** District 6.

**Robert Brust:** District 8.

**Natalie Dylan:** District 4.

**Anthony Cuadro:** District 7.

**Nick Belloni:** District 8.

**Tom Valtin:** District 9.

**Chair:** Steffen Franz, District 2. So we'll move onto the next item which is the review of the minutes from December. I'd like to ask—I see only one member of the public here—if you are intending to speak then please fill out a blue card. Did everyone get a chance to review the minutes? Do I hear a motion?

**Nick Belloni:** District 2, motion to approve.

**Jordyn Aquino:** Second.

**Chair:** Nick Belloni made the motion and Jordyn Aquino seconded the motion. All in favor?

**All:** Aye.

**Chair:** Thank you. Moving on, a very short Chair's report since we had a great PROSAC meeting our last meeting I would like to again for those of you who are here, the cupcakes were awesome. That is the level of respect and decorum I'm looking for on this committee. I say this to you genuinely, that was such a great meeting. I think we all walked away feeling like wow, we did some work. And I appreciate all of your help and attention to trying to keep us on track.

With that said, I want to take a minute to introduce our new member. I'd like her to take a minute or two to introduce herself. Natalie Dillon is from District 4. She is a recent appointee. Why don't you give us two minutes of who you are.

**Natalie Dillon:** Sure. I am a San Francisco native. I grew up in the Mission, went to school at SI, I then went to Stanford where I majored in urban studies and international relations. I wrote my thesis on the spatial relationship between graffiti and crime which is kind of what brings me here.

After graduating school I did not go into urbanism. I hoped to find a job that was working specifically with urban development in international countries and to speak other languages outside of English. But I ended up working at Goldman Sachs for two years and now I'm at Silicon Valley Bank in a venture capital role.

**Chair:** We hope you enjoy the committee and something that you're committed to. Everybody you see at this table is committed to their parks and to parks in general in San Francisco so I would say read up on the history of the committee and any questions that you have we'd be happy to discuss.

Again, I don't really have much else other than you'll notice that our good friend Cristina is taking Tiffany's place tonight. Tiffany unfortunately had to be off for a medical issue so we wish her the best and hope she'll be back for our next meeting.

Other than that I really don't have much. Again, I felt like we all were very focused leading up to the end of 2016 and I would hope that in 2017 we do that same, that all of you bring whatever items you want to discuss, are proactive and supporting our Supervisors and positions as they related to parks and open space.

Is there any public comment on my Chair's report? Being none, that item is closed.

I would like offer a change in the order of the items on your agenda. I would ask if possible if the committee members are okay with it to switch Item #7 with Item #6, so that would be to hear the

SFRPD proposed operations plan prior to hearing the Park Ranger presentation. Does anyone have an objection to this change? Being none, we are switching those agenda items.

Let us get on to our new business. Part of why I moved this up as at the behest of one of our members who isn't here tonight but I think he had a good point in wanting to move up this item and I would like to say that at least every two to three months I would like to bring this item to the front of the agenda so that we can really touch on some of these items, see where we're at with them and then either table them or try to set a date to have them heard.

So again if there any items on here that you want clarity on or we need to discuss certainly CEQA has been on here for a long time. Maya, we know Lennar has been on here. I think that we're in process on trees, on Hort Science. I think that will be in February or March. South Park, Jane do you have any?

**Jane Weil:** I only know what I read and the upset emails that I get from people down there. So I don't know, do you have anything to add about what's happening at South Park?

**Stacy Bradley:** You know, I think it's been a bumpy, challenging project that I believe has been corrected and is on the path to being opened roughly on schedule. It's not too bad, it's not too far off.

**Chair:** I think Stacy one thing I just want to mention because obviously Jane and I were in touch is maybe her concern is less about it getting done on time and more concerned about some of the way the contractor is treating some of the materials or the site. So I think there's some discussion that goes beyond just when it finishes more like practices around what's happening. So again I think why Jane raised this was not to get a brief overview of what's happening it's to get a presentation on where—where it went from everything's all good to it's not as good as we thought it was.

So again I think this is a future agenda item that we may want to talk more in depth about that particular project because Jane identified some very concerning things that should be brought to the table just for future, you know, not necessarily for South Park but maybe for other people's projects.

**Jane Weil:** We actually just talked about the—Nick was here last year I think from DPW talking about the changing contracting where instead of just being the lowest bidder, lowest price bidder we'll be able to do the best value bidder and—

**Chair:** I'm sorry, are you talking about Supervisor Weiner's legislation?

**Stacy Bradley:** Yes. And so it is moving forward and projects starting this spring will start the information on the contractors will be in the—we'll be creating a database with the information. So I think this is one of the many ways of impressing the concerns of South Park. So it will be good to talk about in a couple of months as that is moving forward as well.

**Chair:** That will be great. Again, I think that would address exactly what our concerns are as much so as finishing the park and getting it open it's the kind of understand of what the motivations are and what's happening. Again, I think it impacts not just District 6, it impacts all of our parks.

**Richard Rothman:** District 1. I'm still interested in Lake Merced, what's happening there and the issues there. I know Recreation and Park is having a community meeting later this month.

**Chair:** So would you like to see a presentation?

**Richard Rothman:** Yes.

**Stacy Bradley:** I think we likely can do that. There are two completely separate projects so the one that's where the meeting that's coming up this month is part of the bond. There's actually three projects—there's probably more than I know about. But the one coming up soon is for the bond funding and what you're talking about with the lead is where the Pacific Rod and Gun Club used to be and we're working with Property Management, they're leading that effort to lease the site. Recreation and Park went out, it was approved to [unintelligible]. We can definitely give a more in-depth presentation on that site. We can do all of Lake Merced as an overview with the multiple projects. We're also improving a dock as well. I think that's a COF project and so there's a lot happening and we're going to—that project at the Rod and Gun Club is going to have to go through its environmental review so that's going to take some time.

**Chair:** But you're confident that sometime in the next three months we can see it.

**Stacy Bradley:** Absolutely, absolutely. There's a lot going on.

**Richard Rothman:** District 1. Cassandra said she'd be more than happy.

**Chair:** Let's talk about that in our agenda. So the only other ones that Stacy—you know, unfortunately Linda D. and Sharon are not here but they have raised this on Geneva project and that's still on our can we get a presentation list. Is there any update to any of that?

**Stacy Bradley:** It went out to bid. We have the bids back where Melinda should be wrapping it up and bringing it to Commission for contract award so then once that happens it will—the project won't take that long. I've been working with her closely on getting her building permits and it's amazing how hard every single step is for the capital project. But yes, we could do a presentation on it. I don't know if that one would be that relevant for everybody. The Geneva Community Garden doesn't seem that hot of a topic to have a whole presentation or a meeting. But we could do an urban ag or community garden presentation.

**Chair:** I've been asking for a community gardens and Melinda has just been buried.

**Stacy Bradley:** Buried. And we thought there was going to be relief with the urban ag coordinator who is no longer with us. So the relief is not quite in sight but there are people

working on urban ag. Sarah Madland and Kimberly Kiefer's group. I think in the next couple of months having an update on that would be good.

**Tom Valtin:** District 9. This may be very premature but will Recreation and Park lands be affected by the proposed redevelopment of Park Merced?

**Stacy Bradley:** No.

**Chair:** So there are a couple other things on here. I know for sure that we're going to have a discussion about—I know Linda D. is really adamant—Community Opportunity Fund update back from 2008. There are still projects that [unintelligible] so that's one I know we're going to see at some point.

Pretty much everything else is what it is. It's been sitting around here for a long time. Again, I'd like to get some of these things off this agenda so if there are things on here that you maybe put on here or that you want to see presentations on I would ask you to be more proactive with me so Ana Gee Sergeant MaCaulay Park. So Ana Gee is asking for some sort of presentation or update on MaCaulay Park.

**Stacy Bradley:** This is on here for a future agenda item. You want to have a broader conversation about Sergeant John MaCaulay and [unintelligible] as well?

**Ana Gee:** That's what I was going to say, yeah.

**Chair:** So I would just put that on your way out for the next couple months as well. Any other members? Jane?

**Jane Weil:** District 6. I would like a District 6 acquisitions update if we could have that either tonight or next month.

**Stacy Bradley:** I can do a quick update on that.

**Chair:** Why don't you save that for the capital report. Do all those updates in one go.

**Robert Brust:** Do you remember who put the Twin Peaks Interagency Project on here?

**Chair:** Anthony did.

**Robert Brust:** What is that?

**Anthony Cuadro:** They redesigned the streets up there and where you park and the whole situation and nobody came to talk to us about it.

**Robert Brust:** We're district borders on that also.

**Chair:** So you guys want to hear that as well. [simultaneous comments] I think we have to figure out who [unintelligible].

**Stacy Bradley:** It's us. Melinda is working on that as well and it's a pilot project so while things have happened it's to see how things would work. So we don't have funding for a full redesign of that area, we only have funding for this pilot and the design of the concept plan. But we can talk about that as well in more detail and we can have an MT person come with Melinda.

**Chair:** I think that would be beneficial. Anthony raised this just last month so even if it's March, April, we're find to push it back on the agenda on the calendar for the agenda. Okay, anybody else? Any other committee members, anything? Any public comment on this item? Being none, that item is closed.

Next is capital planning and the ever popular Stacy Bradley.

**Stacy Bradley:** So I was actually going to do this month's presentation a little bit differently and focus on 2012 bond projects, the Let's Play S.F. initiative which was the failing playgrounds initiative and the pools project to give you a bit of a broader overview of those two things. I will briefly, Jane, touch on District 6 the acquisitions but I'll talk about it more next month. We are still in the process of we have the phase two done. They're doing cost estimates so that we can have a range to discuss—to negotiate. So we don't have that range yet and so we haven't started those negotiations but they'll be soon and then we'll be able to go to the Board finally which likely won't happen before next month. So I will still have an update.

So for Let's Play S.F. there were thirteen projects that were ranked in tier 1 and tier 2. Anthony and Mark were both on the task force that led us to that list. Tier 1 all of our projects have started planning and tier 2 the first project has started. So we're doing the philanthropic effort with the Parks Alliance to fully fund this effort as well as a few other funding sources. We have some impact fee money, COF money it going towards it, some Supervisors have dedicated some General Fund monies towards the program. We believe the Vis Valley impact fees will help with [unintelligible]. So there is—we have a collection of funds going to fully fund the project although it hasn't been fully funded yet, this philanthropic money hasn't all come in but for the tier 1 Washington Square has completed its community engagement process and is scheduled at the Historic Preservation Commission in February.

Sergeant MaCaulay and Merced Heights are both in the midst of community engagement. Alice Chalmers, McLaren, and the Panhandle will begin community engagement this spring and West Portal is moving forward from the COF application so that actually has a concept plan already vetted through the community and it will begin—there's some work that staff has to do but then it will begin CEQA and the environmental review as well this spring so we're moving forward on all these projects.

Then for the pools we have Balboa, Garfield and Rossi as our projects under the 2012 bond. For Balboa the community is in construction so the planning is all done. The total budget is \$10.6 million and it's coming from both the 2012 bond and the housing ramp and it should open in later 2017. This is another of our pools where we're adding a floating bulkhead so that will

improve programming. We'll be able to have dual programming at the pool and that also then increases programmable hours and they will be used to help regulate the water and air temperature. Garfield and Rossi are both in community design right now. Garfield has a meeting on the 19<sup>th</sup> and Rossi on the 18<sup>th</sup>. So they are both moving forward at slightly different paces but the Garfield we're planning on constructing that one first and it's approximately \$16 million and will have funding from both the 2012 bond and Easter Neighborhood impact fees.

Rossi is also in design and the big push for Rossi it to improve universal access to the pool. Both of them I believe will have a floating bulkhead because we've noted that the floating bulkhead model works so well for being able to program the space sufficiently. Rossi is approximately \$8 million all from the 2012 bond and the construction schedules for all three of them will be staggered so only one pool is closed at a time.

So if you have things that you would for me to update in the future please let us know and we'll present them.

**Chair:** One thing I'd like to iterate to the committee, it makes this process a lot easier if there are very specific projects that you want to hear more about to email Stacy before the meeting so that she can at least prepare information rather than putting her on the spot. I think this committee became too comfortable with Dawn with her iPad freestyling. I don't think that's fair to put on Stacy. I think it would be much better if it was submitted a week before, a couple days before with an email and she can at least bring some information.

Jane do you want before we close this item is there some specific on either District 6 acquisition or South Park that you feel like you could have more clarity on?

**Jane Weil:** I am not involved with South Park but we got an email from Toby and the community down there so just for the rest of the committee to know there were large concerns about the management of the project and I guess trees were brought out to plant in burlap bags that were left to die. So there were a lot of concerns about the management and the construction.

**Stacy Bradley:** I do believe that Marion and Jake have worked with the contractor and have communicated with Toby on it and her concerns have been allayed but it sounds like she hasn't communicated back out to you.

**Chair:** I got a winner of a letter from her. She was screaming. So it would be nice to know that her concerns are allayed.

**Stacy Bradley:** Her concerns have been allayed. She just emailed Jake and Marion.

**Jane Weil:** And then the acquisition you addressed. So our concern that it's taking too long is our worry.

**Stacy Bradley:** But apparently Real Estate is not concerned about that so I think we're still okay.

**Chair:** Any other direct, specific questions?

**Richard Rothman:** District 1. If you could we're still waiting up for a follow-up for our meeting about the lighting at Beach Chalet.

**Stacy Bradley:** Okay.

**Chair:** Any other committee members with specific concerns?

**Maya Rogers:** District 10. Stacy, are you guys working with Lennar on their open space?

**Stacy Bradley:** Yes. Not as much as we'd like to and all through OCII and I'm hopeful that we will be able to have a more robust relationship with Lennar as we have with all the recent developers and with the development agreements. We don't have anything codified in this development agreement. However, they are routing over plans to us for review but we're not as wrapped up in that conversation as we would like to be. So that's still a work in progress.

**Chair:** Stacy, I'd like to say and I think Maya would agree that those are the types of projects that if we could be of help, trying to facilitate communication between the developers and you guys, we see the virtue of RPD being involved in these developer-based open spaces because we feel like perhaps they don't have the same insight that you do or the same endgame that you do .

**Stacy Bradley:** Agreed. That's what I'm hearing from the Building Department.

**Chair:** And again I think we know what they're good at and what you're good at and so we'd certainly like to see more of that if you're engaged in any way, if that means a rep from PROSAC needs to be at that table, we're more than happy.

Anybody else, any questions for Stacy? Any public comment on this item? Hearing none, thank you Stacy, this item is closed.

We have switched Item 7 with Item 6, we should not be hearing from Taylor on the RPD proposed operations plan.

**Taylor Emerson:** I want to start just today, thanks everybody for having me back, by reminding us of where we are in this process. Prop B set for a real planning cycle that has expanded and deepened our capacity to plan our work. We started back in October with the equity metrics which then were integrated into the strategic plan and you heard in December about the capital plan and now here we are in January with the operational plan.

The operational plan if you remember the strategic plan is a five-year look ahead and then the capital plan is either a two-year or a ten-year look ahead depending on how you look at it. If you admit from the beginning what Dawn put into her plan were really the kind of big thematic efforts that the Capital Division is working.



And the operational plan is due every year also. It's looking ahead to FY 18 and both the capital and operational plan we integrated into the budget, the structure of the budget, which is the final planning policy document.

The operational plan which I'm going to talk about today is an annual look-ahead that's a two-year horizon so this proposal is really just what our focus is going to be in the next year and the year after that. It's quite an effort to think about what we're going to be doing and what the steps are two and a half years ahead and we're going to I think develop the strength and muscle to do this better. Right now as far as we can see right now—did you get this in your email, the table that is structured—the structure this follows the strategic plan, so it's by strategy. What we're going to be doing for each strategy and objective—the Department shall include in the operational plan a statement of the objective and initiatives within the strategic plan the Department plans to undertake or accomplish during the budgetary period which is two years.

The way that the equity analysis is integrated into this is that you'll see the things that kind of touch on either the parks in those equity areas or the residents or the services that we provide in some way are italicized for identification. Next year, we'll be doing this again with just the sequence to two years ahead. Did anyone have a chance to look at this in advance? There isn't really a way to present this so I thought I was imagining it would be more of a discussion. Do you want to start?

**Chair:** I think as far as the members go, I don't know how many of you reviewed this but clearly it's a little different than our usual seeing pretty pictures in PowerPoint. I think this is much more realistic as far as [unintelligible] so I think the questions have to come from members as far as what you see here. I think clearly there is some integration with what Dawn presented us as far as money. Here we're seeing it in functionality.

**Taylor Emerson:** Exactly, like a work plan almost.

**Chair:** That's what it looks like, a work plan over the next two or two and a half years.

**Taylor Emerson:** Right.

**Chair:** I guess one questions I would probably raise from the committee would be in terms of some of these pieces that are ongoing because there's a lot of things here that are kind of ongoing are those pieces that you are in development of policy on or are these things that are just processed and it might be a year before we have any kind of development?

**Taylor Emerson:** Yes.

**Chair:** Let me take an example. The example would be in 11D is ensure 100 percent of San Francisco residents [unintelligible].

**Taylor Emerson:** We are working on that. We worked on that this week actually.

**Chair:** I guess maybe the way you could explain it to the committee is how do you work on it? Do you isolate where there are areas that don't have a park?

**Taylor Emerson:** Yes. I was part of a conference call this week along with one of our GIS planners and we were on the phone. The ten minute calculation is a construct that is executed by the Trust for Public Land and we were on a conference call with their GIS people looking at the gaps to see where we are right now and confirming that they have all the information that we have. I think with this phone call we got to about 99.4 but we think this year we can get it a little further.

**Chair:** I guess what I want to know is what's the correlation between this sounds to me like an acquisition discussion if you're trying to put new parks within a ten-minute walk how does that actually fit into an operational plan?

**Taylor Emerson:** Yeah, I guess the good news on that particular one is it isn't actually an acquisition problem at this point with the possible exception of Treasure Island.

**Female Speaker:** What we've been doing is filling these gaps.

**Taylor Emerson:** Right.

**Chair:** And I think that's in our scope. I mean I think that is exactly in terms of that one item that resonates with all of us. All of us can say hey it would be great to have one more park that's just a little bit closer, make that walk a little bit closer. Because I think our goal is to have that, to have 100 percent.

**Taylor Emerson:** Ours too. And so really what we're doing at this point is narrowing down where are those areas and what is possible.

**Female Speaker:** Could you share that with us, I'd be really curious for my district to see that.

**Taylor Emerson:** I don't know if I could share it. It was a live—we were looking at the screen together, it was just work but.

**Female Speaker:** I think TPL when they do their annual report will have it.

**Taylor Emerson:** It's either March or April that it will come out and it will have where we are and comparable jurisdictions.

**Female Speaker:** Could I request that we add that to our future items to discuss?

**Chair:** I'm sorry?

**Female Speaker:** I would like to add to our future items to discuss when that report comes out expected in March that perhaps in March or April we have a presentation on that.

**Taylor Emerson:** Yes. The Trust for Public park score is a great report, we love talking about it and I'm hoping this year we either stay right where we are or scoot up a little bit because we worked really hard on the survey response this year.

**Chair:** So Jane I would ask that as we get close that you're proactive in terms of telling me and we'll try.

**Taylor Emerson:** I'll try to remember too.

**Chair:** I think just clarify. The ones that you've really dedicated like okay this is who is going to be handling this, that's great.

**Taylor Emerson:** We're hopeful to achieve that particular one this year or possibly next years. It's an ongoing effort to get San Francisco to 100 percent.

**Chair:** I guess one that I would like to ask and I don't know really whether this is a question for you but prioritizing deferred maintenance that is clearly something that we all are interested in seeing progress because I think we all really know that you have certain things aging out and stuff that just needs fixing. I think we'd like to help facilitate that in any way we can whether it's to identify it or just help facilitate it.

So in terms of prioritizing obviously each area, each park has different money to spend. How we prioritize as we move forward in the next two years, what needs to be fixed and what needs to be started again.

**Denny Kern:** What we've got going on, this is a group that we chartered [unintelligible], it's interdisciplinary, it's capital, it's operations. I'm the project lead right now. It was Dawn for the first year, I've got it for the second year. Katie's in on it with about fourteen of us together. It's called project lifecycle, we've given the name and we are moving towards an asset management posture. My little 30-second elevator speech is that up until this point the Department we'd build a park, we'd build a facility and we open it and then we sit back and wait for it to break and then we'd fix it until after it breaks we wait for it to break again and then we keep doing that until you can't fix it anymore then we say well, time to renew it again.

So we're actually trying to manage the lifecycle of the premise, it's design, concept, so it actually realizes over it's supposed to be fifteen years, twenty years, whatever, and we break it out by infrastructure component—the electrical system or plumbing, the hardscape, that type of thing.

To answer your question specifically we are not looking at this geographically by district except that we do like everything we're doing we're looking through the equity lens on this thing. So that is the one thing we're looking at that we are not actually dividing it up by district or anything but we are looking at it in terms of asset class and looking at it horizontally in terms of infrastructure components. Operations has the [unintelligible]. We're moving from a repair context to a preventative maintenance context where you've all done preventative maintenance if

you have a car or a house, if you take your car in for an oil change or to rotate the tires or a six-month tune-up. That's preventative maintenance as opposed to you have a car crash and you have to have the body work done. So we're trying to get to that surface type of preventative maintenance schedule. It's going to be a big pivot for our structural maintenance yard to do this but as we get there that actually should then—we're almost going to have vandalism and so we're always going to have to fix that but at least we're not going to fixing this stuff that we broke ourselves so to speak.

That's not a direct answer to your question but we're on our second year of this effort right now and there will be more to come from it and at some future date we'll be happy to come back.

**Chair:** Denny, I just want to say from our standpoint this has always been something that we just as a committee look at like well of course when they're designing the park they're thinking about the maintenance side and you and I have had this conversation where you're the one that's got to make sure it's running and we and capital and everybody can say yeah it's great let's acquire this place but if we don't have a budget to maintenance it we know what happens. So it's good to hear this is a process where everybody is being conscious. Whoever the next you is going to have either a really great experience or a really bad experience and it sounds like the Department is moving more towards that.

**Denny Kern:** Arguably for me the most important part of the entire five-year plan is certainly on this operations plan.

**Chair:** Again, it jumps out to me as one of the most important for this committee. Thank you. Nick?

**Nick Belloni:** Couple things. This [unintelligible] campaign, how has that been working? Is it working enough to really expand it?

**Stacy Bradley:** Developing stewardship is another way to say that in a very focused destination. Robert might have a comment on this. There are different ways to measure what is success at Dolores Park but we feel that it has been an overall very positive and one thing I like to talk about is that our Recology bill is the same but the service level is much expanded so you don't see mounds of trash on the sidewalk anymore, trash on the ground is not what you see at Dolores. You see litter but that's a little bit different. It's smaller, it's not piles.

**Nick Belloni:** The reason I ask it because they're doing the same thing at the seawall down at Ocean Beach and it's really not done [unintelligible].

**Stacy Bradley:** They have missed kind of the campaign part of it, right. They took the trash cans out and then left town basically.

**Nick Belloni:** But if you understand my point and I'm just saying if that's not working has GGNRA talked to you because I have tried to get them to about how much trash is going from there and they're bringing it over to Golden Gate Park as well.

**Stacy Bradley:** Actually GGNRA has put out a call, they want to have a citywide effort to help talk about how we can manage waste in the public sphere better, perhaps with a more consistent message. So they've actually they're having a trash afternoon in February sometime. OCII, the Port, us, them, the Presidio Trust, we're all going to come and share. UCSF is actually participating as well. So we're going to share our best ideas, we're doing a presentation with more detail about what we did at Dolores, what worked, what didn't, and we are looking for a next park for us improve our waste management at which is really what we see this campaign as.

**Chair:** Denny, following up on this one particular item because I know this is a big part of Phil's overall view, pack in, pack out—do you actually scope that? Do you guys actually see like trash level prior to that policy being engaged versus for example I know I always bring it back to Lafayette Park but for example there is like an actual park that you can look at and same well in 2013 there were maps of garbage but now it seems like for history policy that people are actually picking up after themselves. In other words do you have some data from the gardeners, from the ground that says hey we actually have a lot less trash than we used to or people seem to be picking up on the lawns but stacking it all over here but they're getting data back as this policy runs out.

**Denny Kern:** From the gardener, custodian staff context we haven't tabulated month by month but we do have their anecdotal experience that yes that is the case.

**Chair:** So you are seeing a reduction in trash.

**Denny Kern:** Dolores being ground zero.

**Chair:** Right. Well Dolores that is you know like I was saying Robert has a unique perspective from that park because that park seems to have—

**Denny Kern:** Dolores is the one place where we've got the campaign going and [unintelligible] says it's first and foremost a public awareness public education campaign. We just stay on the user, that's where the trash starts.

**Chair:** Right, but I'll just go back to Lafayette's renovation which had no garbage cans in the park at all, right, and that was part of that campaign.

**Denny Kern:** Yes.

**Chair:** Which was never publically known. People just walked around going why is there no garbage cans in the park until Supervisor Ferrell wants garbage cans and put them there. So again I guess my question is it would help the community if there was data or specifics. I know Dolores is its own thing but with other parks for example. Like again I don't want to get in McLaren—McLaren you could built a car with the parts that are still they're on Recreation and Park land and I go out there, we're working out there and we put up an unbelievable amount of trash. Is it working better in some places? Is it working worse. I think it would just help us if this is your policy and you want us to be the voice of this policy to just understand whether it's working.

**Denny Kern:** We've got antidotal information that you bring up two points, especially once you mentioned McLaren, there's two different issues here, there's trash that users bring in and leave behind, sort of like the Ladybird Johnson Litter Campaign. But then there's the illegal dumping [simultaneous comments].

**Nick Belloni:** Then actually a kind of cool segue, I really need to see a lot in McLaren Park here in this and I might not just be missing it because [unintelligible] but in there there's not a lot to help McLaren Park. Why not? I mean we've got Golden Gate Park getting a whole thing because of the anniversary but I don't see McLaren really getting any kind of anything. I know that park is very under—

**Stacy Bradley:** What is it, \$9 million or \$10 million under 1.2G, right, the 2012 bond projects. It's not more detailed than that but you know McLaren is getting more love than it's gotten in a long time.

**Nick Belloni:** But there's no definite plan. There's no anything here. You're using this as the plan for the upcoming stuff. I'm looking at it if I'm part of McLaren Park I'm sitting here going great I got nothing other than a trail that I saw here. I mean there needs to be some kind of at least hey look here's a phone, we're going to do this for you.

**Chair:** We know that they're \$42 million short. We know that there's \$52 million. We know that they're \$42 million short. We know that there's \$52 needed.

**Stacy Bradley:** For sure.

**Nick Belloni:** It would be nice to see something here if you're going to include this in the operations plan for the coming year say something to say look your park is—we're actually thinking of your park. [unintelligible] but I don't see anything for them and I feel it's our second largest park.

**Stacy Bradley:** Duly noted.

**Robert Brust:** I'm wanted to get back to Denny on Project Lifecycle. I would like you to come back and talk a little bit about how the Dolores campaign is going. Has it been two years now?

**Stacy Bradley:** Well, the first time yeah we did call it [unintelligible] 1.0 and last summer—we call it summer but the peak season is actually April through October, so it's the seven months and we call that 2.0 and we're just in the next few weeks have an internal summit on what we learned, what can be operationalized and what hasn't yet been done that we need to work on.

One of the things we did last year, and I was just working on this today so it's on my mind, is that we're really going deep on some survey results, we did about 500 surveys of users and one of the things we saw which everyone knows already but it was really confirmed in the data is that visitors at Dolores are very habitual. They come there, that's their park, that's their town square,

they're repeat visitors very frequently. The good news about that is that they're really reachable, their teachable, right? This is their park and so one of the survey questions in addition to identifying how frequently people come is like where do they get information about the park and the get it from the park. All of our efforts on Twitter and Instagram and this and that yielded very little payoff actually. We had a big reach for the openings but it turns out that most people got their information from the park itself so I think you're going to see a renewed focus next year on banners which are a useful source of information and the little notes in the bathroom were also—I talked to a custodial Supervisor today—more anecdotes. I found out today we thought no one was tagging all the signage in the bathroom, we thought it was absolutely a miracle that these things that we made for the bathroom mirror, for the bathroom walls, that remind people not to litter and sometimes they were poems and sometimes sassy sayings. We thought those were just staying all summer long. It turns out the custodial Supervisor was making copies of them and when they would get tagged or messed up she would put up new ones because we really felt they were successful and yielded a great payoff because while the mounds of trash have gone away from the interior of the park on the pathways there has been some displacement to the bathroom so we're focused on that particularly on the north side. The south side bathrooms apparently are pretty well under control but the north side bathrooms are going to be a big focus next summer.

**Robert Brust:** The south side is the ones next to the children's playground. It's a different demographic.

**Stacy Bradley:** There is some data I can share with you. It's not a very data rich effort.

**Robert Brust:** You were talking about—we could wrap this up—but you were talking about you wanted to extend this to the other park so this would be maybe sometime this year would be a good time to talk about that.

**Stacy Bradley:** We're keeping our next park a little under wraps but maybe in a few months we could come back.

**Robert Brust:** So Denny you mentioned Project Lifecycle and in here Taylor has developed a post-annual park maintenance objectives for all Recreation and Park Department. Those are two separate things?

**Denny Kern:** Yes.

**Robert Brust:** Do you plan on getting on some of that done this year?

**Denny Kern:** For Project Lifecycle we meet every two weeks and we are rolling out in our work order system called TMA we're starting the preventative maintenance module so we can start actually recording data and getting preventative maintenance work orders out there, like it's time to change the filters, etc.

**Robert Brust:** Are you looking at mostly the new projects like you said here?

**Denny Kern:** We actually doing it not by project but by asset class. So we're actually starting since it's going to be a structural maintenance yard who does the preventative maintenance for starting with the stationary engineers. We'll broaden it to the plumbers, to electricians. It's a massive data collection effort because first you have to collect all the information on your infrastructure, how many linear feet of irrigation line do you have, what is the rating on that pump. Then you start typing in and it will start kicking out times to do the surface on that particular piece of infrastructure.

**Maya Rogers:** Do you feel you have enough resources to come up with goals?

**Denny Kern:** We're starting small and we're going to keep expanding. We're working with JD on maybe bringing in a few more resources to start this. I'd mentioned in my last pitch on this a little while ago that there were two ends of the continuum. Preventative at one end. The other end on capital is capital renewal and being able to have a way to tabulate how that lifecycle is going. Are we 50 percent through the lifecycle. Where is the police point at which well this now goes on the next bond list type of thing so we know when we're supposed to be renewing that particular facility or park or big piece of infrastructure. We're working this year on coming up with what that big database tool is going to be. Some of you may have heard about the database we've had like ten or twelve years ago called Comet and we're going to be replacing Comet because it's kind of defunct.

The two big jobs as I see it in Project Lifecycle is getting the preventative maintenance functions started, expanded and then really embedded in the maintenance yard and on the other end is specking and coming up with what the successor to the Comet database it going to be so we can collect all this information as we do this lifecycle asset management that on the operations end we're maintaining stuff per it's lifecycle and on the capital end they can see what's coming down the pipe, it's about time to start putting this on the capital renewal list rather than making it—I'm overstating the case here—almost a pickup game every time we have a bond campaign.

**Chair:** Which is seems it's been from time to time.

**Stacy Bradley:** And that fits into how the city does the ten-year capital plan,.

**Chair:** From our standpoint again you guys being able to see down the road both from the standpoint of maintenance but also from the standpoint of capital because you are going to reach a point like you're saying where it doesn't pay to fix it anymore.

**Denny Kern:** Deferred maintenance is completed two ways. On the operations side we'll have a project, we're going to replace those pumps or you know it's not a small amount of money but it's not \$50 million. And it's also done by capital renewal, Dolores being case in point.

**Richard Rothman:** I have a couple or questions or suggestions. Under 1.1 to ensure 100 percent of San Francisco residents live within ten minutes walking to a park I'd like to see a sentence or two saying making it safe to walk to the park. 76 percent of the Richmond District residents walk to Golden Gate Park and Fulton Street isn't the safest street to cross.



[simultaneous comments]

**Chair:** That's not really related Richard. I appreciate that you're trying to squeeze in here a safe walk to the park but that's not really what their objective is. Their objective is to have you be able to walk ten minutes to a park. Safety which isn't addressed in this operative by the way. I don't see the word safety really anywhere.

**Nick Belloni:** 13a I would say.

[simultaneous comments]

**Chair:** No, that's not really safety.

**Nick Belloni:** It would be the only thing I could see that's connected to safety.

[simultaneous comments]

**Chair:** I guess this is for Denny or Taylor, I have some [unintelligible] who asked does the Department every actually do safety surveys, like how safe do people feel in their parks. And I thought that was actually a really—and again, it's not really a Park Patrol thing although it segues nicely into your presentation, how much data do you have on not how many incidents—we already know in the strategic plan how many incident happened, we asked for that specific. How about how safe residents feel because I think that's what we're getting to is yeah I can be ten minutes from my park but I don't really feel good about getting from here to there and I think that's a very real point that in certain areas—for example we have a streetlight go out on Sacramento it's the safest neighborhood in town, right, that streetlight goes out bam! Cars are getting broken into the next day. So again, this broken window whatever you want to call that theory—do people feel more safe in parks today or do they feel less safe in parks today?

**Denny Kern:** You've raised a couple things. I will say that strategy 1.3 or the initiative 1.3 good park behavior that is the strategic plan's strategy for parkland security and park user safety. But on the one hand I'm not going to directly answer your question. You've asked how do park users feel. Well I mean it's a valid question. I don't think we have that survey data. But the other thing you mentioned about you moving from park to park, going down Fulton Street or going from this park to that park, that's actually not our mission. I'm not trying to point fingers but we only have jurisdiction over parkland.

**Chair:** I think Richard's concern was about walking on Fulton Street, I think mine is I'm a park stakeholder and there are certain areas of my park I feel safe and there's some areas I don't. Is that information being collected? Is there a vehicle to allow people to say I really love the tennis court, the dog run is great, but at night I don't feel safe?

**Denny Kern:** The answer to your question is no. We don't collect that data.

**Taylor Emerson:** I will say the city survey which is conducted every other year by the Controller's Office and is all about—it's entirely about this kind of resident perception of feelings. It's totally subjective how you feel about this or that. There are a number of safety questions in the city survey. I'd be happy to send you a link. The questions about parks are not in our section, they're actually in the P.D. section about general safety. If you're talking just about parks there is information in here about car traffic, 1.3D, about bikes which is 2.3C and there's tree work in here. So I think all of those together are actually working towards improving safety.

[simultaneous comments]

**Robert Brust:** But it is park's jurisdiction for trails in the park so if they opened up more trails on Fulton Street so people could get access into the park from Fulton Street, I'm sorry I disagree, I think Recreation and Park and MTA need to work together to make it safe for people who walk to the parks. So if they did their part in opening more trails so people can walk into the park then MTA could put in whatever safety measures that needs to be done. I think they need to work together. Parks needs to open more trail and MTA needs to make the streets safer. They did that with the speed humps, they worked together.

**Taylor Emerson:** I've written it down. I think that's a valid query about improving access.

**Robert Brust:** I'm not finished. Thank you for putting in about the WPA murals. I think under 3.3D I would add the Mother's Building because we have funding and things are progressing along and so it should be listed under section B of 3.3.

**Taylor Emerson:** Okay.

**Chair:** The only thing I'll tack onto that would be the goal of the strategic plan is to isolate or identify [unintelligible] and we all know what that term means and you are building or acquiring new parks in those areas. Then I would say that safety has to be a priority. I think that it has to be within our focus as a community-based group to identify areas where you say yes we want to put a new open space here but then the question is okay so we build it but now people don't feel comfortable or not safe, doesn't that beg to be in front of the acquisition? I don't know. That's a question maybe not for this year but for next or the following once you start acquiring spaces in the equity zones determining how people feel or how safe they are within those zones becomes really important to where we're spending our money.

**Taylor Emerson:** Yes.

**Anthony Cuadro:** Under 1.2E which we were talking about lifecycle I just want to point out it's the only item on here that has nothing written under fiscal year 17-18.

**Taylor Emerson:** This is still a draft. We caught numerous mistakes today. It's a work in progress up until the Commission approves it and even thereafter.

**Anthony Cuadro:** Then on 1.4A this reenvisioning Kezar Pavilion. This is the first I've heard of that.

**Taylor Emerson:** Us too.

**Anthony Cuadro:** I don't know if that's something we can talk about in the future or if this is something that looks like it's going to be talked about soon.

**Taylor Emerson:** We are starting to think about how we would think about envisioning that. There's been seismic estimates a few years ago and I think it was such a big number everyone just quit and did other work for a while. It's come up on our list.

[simultaneous comments]

**Taylor Emerson:** What did write on that? Develop a scope to commence a study. There's also a Kezar Authority I think, a citizen's group focused on Kezar.

**Maya Rodgers:** On access I think you have to be mindful about when you talk about safety are we talking about access or talking about safety because it can be a bit [unintelligible]. I agree that it should be a collaborative conversation but I would hate to be bogged down.

**Chair:** I think on the opposite side you don't want to build it and they will come and hope that words out and have this wonderful facility that people don't feel safe so it does have to be part of the conversation but I agree with you and I think we all agree that we wouldn't want to escalate it to the point where now we have to go to the Police Commission and have discussions.

**Taylor Emerson:** There's so many areas—it's lighting, line of sight and the design, it's activation. The safest park is a busy park. So it's all of these. Stewardship is a big part of it. I think Dolores feel safer just that there aren't people peeing everywhere.

**Ana Gee:** District 6. I have a question about 2.1 and A, B, C and D. Just would you be willing to share the different methods that the Department will use to help make the data into [unintelligible] recreation programs.

**Taylor Emerson:** Just to do inclusive recreation programs it's been growing every year, ever since we start adaptive programming it's been—Denny could talk more about this since recreation is under him—but our goal is definitely to do more of it and part of that is we're doing a little bit more demand and supply analysis, looking at waitlists and thinking about well if there's a big waitlist for this there's high demand, could we replicate that program and have more people be able to take it. Some of them you can't do another Silvertree at Glen Park but you can do more skateboard camps and we've really been trying to respond to demand more closely with rec programming and inclusive programming definitely is part of that.

As far as data collection I could talk so long about it. I've gone deep on data collection. There's all kinds of methods from the old school people, observational surveys, accounting, to using the internet of things, putting sensors in doorways or counting footfalls to see how many people are going places. So I've got a meeting later in the week with the consulting company that did a bunch of counting as bar of Better Market Street. They counted Market in different areas and

then put in some of the living innovations there and then counted again, activation again, activation makes it feel safe. I hope we're able to do more counting this year. That's partly some of my work over the next year and I think it's going to be a mix of different methods and I'd love to come back and talk about what we're able to do in the first year. Part of it right now is just surveying the opportunities. Supervisor Ferrell gave a \$300,000 grant to the San Francisco Parks Alliance and we're hoping to implement the Rose and we're hoping to use that money to do some counting. Do we have surveys first? No, we don't even know how many people go so we're starting a little setback from that. But if we did have some good information even a sample like at new renovated rec center, this is approximately the population you'll see it would help us to right size programming and services levels and things like that. I'm excited by the opportunities to do more counting of so many users that go uncounted in our system.

**Ana Gee:** How can I myself get access to this data, specifically to the clubhouses in District 6?

**Taylor Emerson:** You and me both. How could we figure out how many people are using the clubhouses. We don't have any of that information now but we want to try to start counting more. If you look at the program registration at Joe Lee there is no programs and no one goes there but if you go there it's full of people So how do we capture this data? I envision these little sensors in the door that will count the people. I don't know if that's possible, we're investigating these things. There's Wi-Fi enabled benches that can count for 200 feet around them. We're looking at the technology in an old school way. With no money how can we do it?

**Chair:** Clearly these numbers [unintelligible]

**Taylor Emerson:** Data, yeah, I want it! I want to know.

**Jordyn Aquino:** I have a question for 3.2A which is the development [unintelligible] process to better understand the needs of park users in equity zones. That was something that we touched upon in our working group last year but I see in fiscal year 17-18 the goal was to collaborate with HRC. I wanted to know more information about that because [unintelligible]. What does that mean?

**Taylor Emerson:** Yeah, we're trying to figure out how to do this. We're good at doing engagement around capital projects. We're definitely expert at that. We don't really know how to do this. HRC's mission and their focus is changing to equity, expanding to include equity, and we're looking to them to help guide us. We're working with other city Departments who are working on it. I just had a big meeting with the Controller earlier in the week because so many Departments are independently working equity right now is there going to be a citywide—you know, how do we go out and talk about it?

So it's hard to know a lot of steps down the road. When we wrote this I was thinking that they might help [unintelligible] shake the campaign or an outreach program. It might turn out to be some folks at City Planning are doing a lot more outreach along equity and we might work together on that. I'm looking for this. We're looking to develop this.

**Jordyn Aquino:** So there's already been a discussion?

**Taylor Emerson:** Definitely. Informal though.

**Chair:** Robert, a follow-up?

**Robert Brust:** Yes. Well it's sort of a new question. So this is table one?

**Taylor Emerson:** That's it, this is it.

**Robert Brust:** Is this the plan?

**Taylor Emerson:** This is the plan.

**Robert Brust:** This is not what I expected. I'm not sure if this is what the Board of Supervisors and SFPA had in mind when this did Prop B and I know you didn't have a whole lot of time but there was money put aside for this in Prop B wasn't there? How much money, does anyone remember off the top of their head?

**Taylor Emerson:** The only reference to money is it says we can use money to hire a consultant to do our strategic plan. That's the only reference to that.

**Robert Brust:** We were so excited that we put that in and we said you guys could hire a consultant. Okay.

**Taylor Emerson:** Is there anything missing that you see?

**Robert Brust:** Goals, actual deliverables. Something more of a nuts and bolts operational plan. Targets for the year rather than this. Yes, I did read it and my first and I think still consider this an actual just taken right out of the strategic plan which we love the strategic plan.

**Taylor Emerson:** Oh, who knew? Okay.

[simultaneous comments]

**Taylor Emerson:** It's a two-year focus for what we think within the broad five-year reach of the strategic plan that we think we can either it says—and I have been charged with being too much of a literalist when it comes to the charter—to undertake or accomplish. So this feels like a list of what we think we're going to undertake or accomplish.

**Robert Brust:** But it also asks for an operational plan. And it asks for us to comment on it and I've commented and now we're going to send it off to the Commission and see what they think. They'll probably be just tickled pink with it knowing them.

**Taylor Emerson:** It is different. It doesn't have the production value that our documents usually have.

**Robert Brust:** With the slides shows?

**Taylor Emerson:** It is actually just a list of things to do.

**Robert Brust:** Yeah but the list is taken off the last slide show.

**Taylor Emerson:** Yeah.

**Chair:** Well, because those were the objectives.

**Taylor Emerson:** Should it be something different?

**Chair:** That is exactly what they said they would do is take those objectives and turn them into tangible actions. I agree it's not as pretty as the strategic plan.

**Robert Brust:** No, no, no, I don't want pretty. I don't want pretty. I just think something a little more than a phrase when it comes to—

**Male Speaker:** I think it's formatting.

**Robert Brust:** It's a formatting problem?

**Male Speaker:** Yeah, like it's hard to see what's going to be the result. You're looking for goals and objectives.

**Robert Brust:** Yes.

**Male Speaker:** You're looking for that tangible sort of—

**Robert Brust:** Yes.

**Male Speaker:** This is like a working sheet, it's tough on the eyes to read. I kind of agree, something more tangible that would show.

**Nick Belloni:** I think this is good for right now. Maybe at the end of next year at the end of fiscal 18 we see how much of this was actually accomplished.

**Taylor Emerson:** Right.

**Nick Belloni:** That would be where we would go, where I would see goals at that point. Until 18-19, until the end of fiscal year 17-18 we have to give them the leeway to go hey, this is what you said you were going to do, did you do it?

**Taylor Emerson:** Were you able to do it?

**Nick Belloni:** Yeah.

**Taylor Emerson:** Right, yeah.

**Nick Belloni:** That's kind of what I think this is and I think this is a good path to that. But I understand what you want to have goals and objectives. I see that but I think we can't ask for that until we get a realistic did you get past 17-18 and everything you said you were trying to do.

**Chair:** I think Robert to allay the rest of this discussion which could go on and on about what it looks like versus what it is I think we do have to give the Department some time to basically put these items out on the table. What they've done here is they've given us a laundry list and said these are all things that we would like to do within the scope of the operational plan. Some of this stuff is in process, some is not. I agree with you in the fact that we're going to go to Commission. I don't know how the Commission is going to view this versus how they view the strategic plan but I think from our perspective and this is a compliment to many of the members who are on working group for the strategic plan there's a lot of items in here that were identified as part of the dialog with the Department. So now we kind of have to say okay well clearly we're not going to come away from this going yeah this is it, this is exactly it, let's make tee-shirts out of this. But what we are going to say is it is a work in progress and it's a laundry list.

Before I continue I want to take a timeout for a second. I'll take everybody's attention. At 8:00 o'clock the fire system for all of City Hall is going to go off. You do not have to leave the building. This is not a fire drill, they're just testing the system. So if you hear that going off you are safe, you don't have to get under the table, you don't have to run out of the building.

**Robert Brust:** Thank you Taylor.

**Taylor Emerson:** Thank you Robert.

**Chair:** Robert your point is well taken. If we were going to sit here and scrutinize and sit here for four hours and go through line by line we could easily say we'd like more data.

**Nick Belloni:** But I do hope you think about incorporating some of the stuff we did mention tonight.

**Taylor Emerson:** Yes. I'm definitely going to do some steps for Project Lifestyle and I hope to add that name Project Lifestyle. I want to go back and look at our initiatives and see if there's anything we can specify and McLaren, add the words safety and access, like is there a way to reinforce our commitment to that and adding the Mother's Building to our ongoing partner-driven renovation projects. I know that those other ones have a status, this is really Lisa Branston's list so let me go back and see if the Mother's Building fits with that list now.

**Chair:** I'm going to wrap up this topic. I did want to quickly address with any—just a general [unintelligible] have become quite a conversation piece here both on the record and off the record. I saw something that I thought was interesting, I'd never seen it used before, that would be 4.1B, 15 down from 90.

**Denny Kern:** We have targeted a [unintelligible] maintenance cycle and it's going to be a process to get there but we've got more resources in the Urban Forestry Unit and we also have through Prop B and capital fund—the general fund capital budget—I do have some free maintenance contract money that we are using now. [unintelligible] lines up with the City Planning Department and our joint effort with them on financing the urban forest [unintelligible] the two studies they did. So we're getting ready to implement that.

**Chair:** I know that's one that we heard from Hort Science the last time a lot of these members weren't on PROSAC we heard from them, they guesstimated about ninety years in the tree cycle and for you to go from ninety years to fifteen years would be impressive because I think when you use that just coming from a layman's perspective if you talk to people in the park and you say yeah the next time I'm going to touch that tree is ninety years from now.  
[simultaneous comments]

**Denny Kern:** Alamo Square is probably my first park—well, Washington Square—and then Alamo Square I've got assessments and maintenance and I've touched every tree and we start moving around. So I mean it will be iterative. At some point I can't tell you how many years from now I have the whole fifteen year cycle system wide but we're starting.

**Chair:** And obviously as you get it going the shorter the cycle will become [unintelligible]. Okay. The only other thing I want to touch on and it's less for the Department, it's more for the members, there are certain items in this laundry list that PROSAC's name is next to so that would be the Park Ambassador program and certainly the sister parks. I am a strong proponent of the sister parks concept and I will [unintelligible].

**Taylor Emerson:** You have some tasks.

**Chair:** So what I would like to do rather than get into a long discussion on what PROSAC's roles are I'd like you all to take this home and have a little homework and go through here and identify the areas where PROSAC is being charged for these things. We are going to try to debut a sister park relationship which I think is fully within the scope of PROSAC's charge. But I would also add the Park Ambassador program is definitely something you should be more involved with as members. So I would just say as PROSAC you're now we're sharing in responsibilities with the Department so I would ask you to be more proactive as you look through these documents.

Are these any other comments on this item? Any public comment on this item? Being none, that item is closed. Taylor, thank you very much.

**Taylor Emerson:** Thank you, I enjoyed the discussion. It makes it better when we work together.

**Chair:** I'd like to thank Denny for coming. Thank you for helping us. Let's move on. Thank you Mike for hanging around. I also want to say before you start your presentation—this dates back a little for PROSAC members who haven't been involved in the discussion about Park



Patrol, this is something that is deeply in our scope, this is in our purview. Park Patrol is an important component of parks and to that end everything I've ever voted on with relationship to increasing Park Patrol I have always been supportive and I think many of us have always been supportive of staffing up and being able to actually do their jobs. So it's great to have you here. We look forward to hearing from you in the future.

**Mike Celeste:** Thank you for having me. I'm the new Chief here. I've been here a year in December, I started in December of 2015. I've enjoyed it and so far I've learned a lot. I've been in law enforcement for about 26 years, all of it in San Mateo County. I came up here and started to learn about the parks here in San Francisco.

My slide show is only about sixty slides so we should get out of here [laughs]. It's a short one.

This is the organizational chart that we go by here which is our General Manager Phil Ginsburg as you all know; Denny Kern, Director of Operations; and then it goes down to myself. From there in the Park Ranger Division my next is Lieutenant Marcus Santiago who will go over a couple of slides here. Most of you I think probably know, he's been here for many years.

Recently this past year we have hired five Dispatchers so we now have 24 hours coverage in our dispatch center, 365 days a year. We just promoted three new Sergeants which brought us up to four Sergeants. So as of this upcoming Friday we will have a Sergeant on duty 24 hours a day, 365. So that's really going to help us out. In the past it's just been Marcus and myself during the day but we're in meetings so now we're going to have an inline Supervisor there which will really help out. They're going to be on a twelve-hour shift. And then we have our Park Rangers that are out and about in the community.

Since I've been here what I've watched is the Park Rangers have been just reactive. You call, we show up. I want to see the Park Rangers out and about, park of the community, and that's where you saw that community policing in the plan Taylor had.

What it means—I know the word policing is in there. It's a partnership between the parks and the us, the Park Rangers. It's our Park Rangers getting out into the parks without being called. Our Park Rangers being out in the parks as ambassadors, talking to the tourists, giving directions, being a deterrent in that uniform, sitting in a car parked out there. Now there's way more parks than we have Park Rangers, we understand that, but as we're hiring new rangers this is the plan that we're moving forward and looking to the future on and I think it's going to really help and my goal is to see certainly Park Rangers in certain parks for at least a year so they get to know the community, they get to know the people in the parks, the areas around the parks, they get to know them by name and that's a really big thing in the world we live in today.

So what do we do out there? Our main goal is to reinforce the San Francisco Park Code. We do parking citations and enforcement for parking. We are not able to do vehicle stops or enforce the vehicle code for stop signs or speed. We asked SFPD to step in and help up out on that which they do.

Again, community policing, what I talked about. Medical aid and first aid. We're out there, all our cars are staffed with medical equipment for first aid before paramedics come we can assist and help out and give directions. Handle dynamic situations such as everyday stuff, earthquakes, emergency preparedness and training. Training—my background when I retired as a Sergeant from Colma Police Department for five years after that I ran the Police Academy for San Mateo County. So training to me is the number one thing and right when I started up here Marcus and I partnered with the San Francisco Police Academy and the CIT training which is the crisis intervention training that is mandated that all SFPD officers go through we are doing the same thing. SFPD took us in and ran our Park Rangers through the CIT also which is really helping them.

Liaison with San Francisco Police and Fire. Lost and found, items that are lost in the parks are in abundance and we have them, we keep them for three months and then we'll dispose of them or if it's good stuff we'll give them out. And then general public relations. And these are just the calls for service that we get on a daily basis from vandalism to burglaries to vehicle theft which is out of control as we all know. Illegal dumping with Denny Kern talked about. Traffic accidents. Fights. Graffiti. Threats. Gang activity. Sexual assaults. Crisis response. And many more. The phone is ringing all the time. Permit violations. For all the permits that Recreation and Park gives out we have to monitor those permits that they're honored and follow the contracts that they're given.

**Marcus Santiago:** I've been around the parks for seventeen years. This slide shows our citations and field interviews and incident reports for the year 2016. It shows you that we have a high rate of citations we're issuing and it could be for anything. It could be for permit violations, amplified sound in Dolores Park, people not obeying the signs, people in the parks after hours, and all the other different violations that are in the Park Code. Our primary responsibility is for the parks and the Park Code. So we do that more than we would do what the police normally do.

The first line there is actually the citations issued. So you would see in January of 2016 we issued approximately 342 tickets. Now this is with I think I believe in January, 2016, we only had about seventeen Park Rangers for the whole city. And so even though the citations go up and down it's still until this year is when we start hiring—right now we have thirteen people in our in-house academy that we're training right now that should be hopefully on the streets within the next month or so. But those are the actual citations that were issued for all kinds of different things. It could be for smoking, drinking, being in the park after hours, could be sleeping in the park after hours. There's a lot of different dynamics of the citation that we issue.

The second one is a dark blue color but that's kind of what we call field interviews. So we may not necessarily always give out a citation. We might warn somebody. We get a lot of tourists that come through the park and the last thing we want to do is give them a bad experience like issue them a citation and they're from France and they think they're going to go to jail. So we do issue a lot of field interview cards during the course of our meeting people and talking to people.

The last part of the bar are our incident reports. They are a little bit low but then again like I said our incident reports are for vandalism, possibly car accidents and different things like that. But again we're looking at approximately seventeen people at that time was our full staff and that

doesn't take into consideration people who might be out sick or on vacation. So that's why the numbers are the way they are.

**Mike Celeste:** When I started here my philosophy to the Park Ranger was education first. So it's to get out to these parks if you see somebody doing something wrong. If there's a dog off the leash talk to the person. 95 percent of them say yeah, no problem. Some don't. If they're in an area where you can't smoke in the park so we tell them. We don't just walk out and say you're smoking and give a citation. That is not how it works. It's education first and then some people don't want to comply. Sometimes a citation makes them comply.

**Male Speaker:** How many field interviews end up turning into citations?

**Marcus Santiago:** The field interviews are actually just field interviews. If they get a citation then it's a citation. They don't give both. You get one or the other and a field interview is only when you feel you might have a problem that will arise later on. So what you want to do is document it. So if I see somebody who is a professional dog walker and they're walking out there and I approach them and say hey look by the way do you have your permit? And they would say oh yeah no I don't have one but I'll get one later. Okay, that's fine. But since I see you here and I'm going to think that you're going to be back in the same park because they are creatures of habits then I'll say you know I just need to get your information to find out who you are. So If come back the next day or two days later or another ranger goes out there and says I just need to get your information because I see this violation occurring they can run their name in the system based on that field interview card and then make a determination hey I think that you're not—you know, this is the fifth time we've contacted you so I think in order to get you to comply we may need to issue a citation. These are infractions so they're a fine or they go down and talk about what they did wrong.

**Male Speaker:** The other question is how many smoking in the park tickets have you been giving because that's one of the complaints I do get a lot.

**Marcus Santiago:** I don't have that specific data. A lot of our stuff is hey let's give them a warning. Part of the biggest issue we get is I didn't see a sign, I didn't know. Which is understandable for people that come from out of the city to enjoy the parks may not necessarily know all the rules.

**Richard Rothman:** District 1. I have two questions. How long is the in-house training?

**Marcus Santiago:** Right now it's two months.

**Richard Rothman:** The second question is an observation that I guess the last time was the Christmas party at McLaren Lodge that I assume it was one of your officer because he had a uniform on but he had his own car with a Recreation and Park decal, like a black pickup. Do you allow that?

**Mike Celeste:** In our pool of rangers we have what we call as-needed Park Rangers and what they do is we assign them to fixed posts. Like you probably saw the vehicle at a road closure. We

allow them to put the sticker on to identify them that they're a Park Ranger so somebody doesn't think they're just anybody. They don't patrol in the vehicles, they're usually parked like I said at a fixed post to let the public know that the yes that car is behind the barricade but it's because it's a Park Ranger who owns that vehicle.

**Richard Rothman:** It reminded me of a rental cop. Nothing personal but when I saw and I says well why can't they give them cars?

**Mike Celeste:** It's a great observation and if we could and we have the resources we would do that. I can give you a rough estimate here—we have approximately seven cars to ferry everybody around the whole city, 24/7 and 365 days a year. Right now we just brought thirteen people onboard and we're not sure how to get them around. We're looking at bicycles and electric utility vehicles.

**Chair:** With regards to the last slide—and you don't have to go back. One area that I think we as stakeholders all have experienced is there used to be a don't ask don't tell policy within the park and I don't mean that in a negative way, I mean there weren't enough Park Rangers to enforce so it wasn't enforcement and when there wasn't enforcement there was continued behavior. Once that behavior had gone on for so long how do you step back from that and I speak specifically with the off-leash dog issues. In my park in particular people have not been cited in so long that they just kind of took it—and again, Lafayette's renovation has helped that, we have a new DPA but I'm sure there are parks within the system where people just didn't know they couldn't have dogs off-leash and I like the fact that you start by educating them. That model, that mindset I champion. I really believe that's your way to success because I think leaving it kind of with signs and ambiguous and—Park Ranger, I haven't seen a Park Ranger in Lafayette Park since the fall social. Is it really educating people going out and being present and being in uniform and talking to people that's the most proactive, that's the most establishing thing that you guys can do.

**Mike Celeste:** As part of the plan we're trying to implement with community policing that's exactly what's going to happen. We'll have a Park Ranger kind of assigned to an area or maybe even a Supervisorial District. They will be responsible for meeting with neighborhood groups, going and talking to people, and when we get a place that has a problem just like Lafayette Park where they say hey we've got a lot of off-leash dog problems then we will put them up there in our first campaign for the first three or four weeks or a months to educate all the people that go up there and after that cycle of one month we should have been able to encompass a lot of the people who normally come up there that don't know the rules or have for such a long time assumed that it was okay to do. And then after that then we can start doing enforcement and I can tell you once one or two people get a ticket we will definitely hear or see the change.

**Chair:** I'm a dog advocate, a very strong supporter of having more off-leash areas. I'm a firm believer and I would say this for years just write your tickets and they will comply because in reality nobody has told them otherwise and they'll walk around and be sure happy to chuck that ball for that dog. But they're not in compliance. They're obviously breaking, infracting, whatever you want to call that term, but as soon as they see you and see that pad come out everything changes. Everybody gets real humble real quick, puts that dog on a leash and is gone.

**Mike Celeste:** We've gone to some parks and did the education and then we cited one or two people and when we show up they pick up their dog and run.

**Chair:** I love that. That's the best policy you can have is not intimidation but letting them know like look you're not in compliance it's going to cost you.

**Nick Belloni:** It's like putting up a new stop sign on the street. You don't put the red sign up and then a cop sits there and cites every car going through it because they've done it for twenty years.

**Chair:** We need to reeducate them.

**Nick Belloni:** That's going to help, the big push that will help.

**Male Speaker:** You're talking about community policing well this would be good to blend that in with the Park Ambassadors because that can help you to get more Park Ambassadors by having these new rangers that are out there. The rangers learn the people and questions that they have and what would happen and the people learn from the rangers and I think that would be a great melt right there. We talk about it in this, we talk about it in the strategic plan. That is something you might do and might actually get you guys extra funding at the same point.

**Chair:** It will certainly get you support for the community itself.

**Marcus Santiago:** The next slide is Park Ranger technology which is surveillance cameras that we have. As of now these are the parks that have cameras—the Beach Chalet soccer fields, Betty Ann Ong, Boeddeker, Coit Tower, Conservatory of Flowers, Crocker-Amazon, these were just installed. Dolores Park has some around the maintenance yard. Hertz, McLaren Lodge, Palace of Fine Arts and the Marina just put theirs up also. Now, these cameras are not monitored 24 hours a day. The cameras are on 24 hours a day. They record 24 hours a day. The data is stored approximately 30 days. After 30 days it gets written over and it's gone. So if we're asked by someone hey something happened here and it's within the 30 days we may have it if it was under the view of the cameras. We can see about 50 percent, maybe 60 percent of these cameras in our office. Some of them we don't have the connectivity yet to get to the officer but we can go down to the park and view it if something happened. But they're not being watched every day. Our Dispatchers have the screens up in the dispatch center so if they're sending a Park Ranger down to an area that does have cameras it really helps for safety when they're rolling down there that they can say here's what we can see. But we're just starting this out now and it's worked pretty good.

**Chair:** What's your perspective and I think the committee would want to know what's your perspective if you have 210 parks I see 12 so is that going to—is it something you envision if you had funding to expand as far as more cameras?

**Marcus Santiago:** I would say absolutely. It goes through Denny Kern. It's going to be a financial thing at the end of the day.

[simultaneous comments]

**Marcus Santiago:** They do help. Palace of Fine Arts we've watched cars get broken into, we've got license plates, given over to P.D. and it does help.

**Male Speaker:** Do the P.D. have access to your cameras?

**Marcus Santiago:** Yes.

**Chair:** If there was an incident and you knew there was an incident you would turn it over.

**Marcus Santiago:** Absolutely. Any time there's an incident and they need a video they send over video retrieval officer specialized in retrieving that information for court purposes in the chain of command and then we meet with them to give them access and work with them on getting it. There is one station that's able to watch the cameras in real time as they do surveillance and it's only for the time that they need it. The primary control falls on our Department.

**Jordyn Aquino:** So how were these list of parks identified. Like is there a correlation with these parks that have a majority of the incidents.

[simultaneous comments]

**Marcus Santiago:** It's been responsive as things have happened. It's just been responsive to hot spots. Not Betty Ann Ong, I mean that was just built into the capital project.

**Mike Celeste:** I can tell you that Betty Ann Ang, Boeddeker Park, the Beach Chalet. But most of those were done as they were getting renovated so they weren't done because there was a big crime problem there. The one that was and I think the Palace of Fine Arts was kind of gifted to us. But the Marina was just done when they upgraded the harbor and when they do the east side of the harbor they're going to again reinstall some new cameras as part of that capital project.

**Male Speaker:** Crocker-Amazon just went through, we just put those up and there's about 10-13 cameras there.

**Mike Celeste:** Yeah, 13.

**Chair:** I guess this isn't really a Denny question, this is probably more a Stacy question, in capital projects considering how valuable this is to the rangers will it be built in to all capital projects moving forward that if the possibility exists for technology to aid them would that be something the Department would just build into newer capital projects?

**Stacy Bradley:** I don't know if we'll do them for every one. At the moment I think it's a case by case basis and we do work with operations when we're doing the renovations so if there's a desire for it yes and we had funding then yes.

**Chair:** Certainly going backwards in other words like them saying hey we identify this hot spot you just renovated it a year ago and we have no cameras to actually support that wouldn't that be a better spend than a kid's water pump. Clearly there's a way for you guys to look at it and say hey this would save on maintenance budget, this would help us out by understanding what's on in the park.

**Mike Celeste:** Everything's in the mix. Everything's on the table.

**Chair:** From PROSAC's perspective I think having more within the capital effort would be great to put that as a priority. Ana Gee you have waited.

**Ana Gee:** District 6. The fact that there is Palega Park [unintelligible] will that minimize the actual rangers coming into the park?

**Mike Celeste:** No, not at all. The ranger will always be there whether there's cameras or not. Actually it's good for us because we can see if they're there. In a sense it works both ways. That won't take the place of Park Rangers it just gives us the ability to see things that if they were not on the site and for instance we'll use Coit Tower, sometimes we get alarms at Coit Tower at nighttime and it's good that as the Park Rangers heading down there the Dispatch can look and see if there's somebody walking around in there and go hey yeah I see somebody and this is what he looks like and then they can call the police so we can all get there at the same time and catch this guy.

**Jane Weil:** Thinking about what you were saying about cars and transportation and bicycles and you mix in with the equity in Tenderloin and District 6 [unintelligible] and Boeddeker, it would be fabulous to have one ranger with a bike that could zip back and forth among all of those.

**Marcus Santiago:** I think part of that—Mike and I were talking about it—is because Civic Center too is a big hub out here and we're planning to figure out a way for them to do Civic Center, Sergeant MaCauly, Tenderloin Rec, and Turk and Hyde minipark all together in the same beat area and be on bicycle or even walk.

**Male Speaker:** Is Coit Tower the building or parking lot, what is that? Because there was an incident there recently, was the cameras use in helping?

**Marcus Santiago:** No, we only monitor inside the buildings. We do not have our cameras outside into the neighborhood. We only are using our cameras to protect the inside of the building and make sure in case somebody breaks in.

**Male Speaker:** That's Coit Tower though. At Crocker-Amazon we have cameras out in the fields.

**Marcus Santiago:** But they don't look in houses. And at Coit Tower there are a set of cameras that are in the parking lot because that's actually an MTA thing in the parking lot and so they watch the parking lot. Our cameras only watch inside the building which includes the murals which are really important for us to preserve. So we keep eyes on the murals and anything that's interior of the building on the first floor.

**Mike Celeste:** A lot of those cameras they're not really focused but their field of view is the parkland. One of them we had this big push from the neighbors oh we want you to be surveilling our driveways too.

[simultaneous comments]

**Chair:** Any other questions on technology?

**Mike Celeste:** This is my last slide. I just want to go over what we have. So when I started in December of 2015 we had 24 fulltime rangers, 5 Supervisors, 4 Sergeants, and the Lieutenant, 5 dispatchers and 7 part-time. Currently right now 43 fulltime Park Rangers, Marcus has 14 Park Rangers right now in training that he's had since December 5<sup>th</sup> that will be out by the first week of February and we still have our 5 Supervisors, dispatchers. We added 2 more part-time rangers so we've already grown our staff there. Our future goal is to have 80 Park Rangers out and about and when that happens you will then see Park Rangers.

We have bicycles. You may have seen the quad. We have four quads that we have out in Golden Gate Park. We will move those around to certain events, Stern Grove, we've had them at Civic Center. We just are purchasing UTV which are utility type vehicles which are two seaters side by side. They're like a golf cart but a little more heavy duty. So you're going to see a lot more.

And just to give you a little bit of perspective when the Denny got here it was myself and five other Park Rangers for the whole city. We have exponentially with the help of the community and groups like yours helped us get where we needed to go by letting the Supervisors know that safety in the parks is a really important thing.

What we want to put out from all of you is to call us. If you see something say something. But call us. I mean for anything call 311, call our direct number, just call us, we'll be there.

**Male Speaker:** What is your direct number?

**Mike Celeste:** 242-6390. That's the dispatch number, it goes right to our dispatch. If our dispatch is not there the phones are forwarded to the Supervisor on shift so the phones will be answered.

I want to also put out there that not only do we do the enforcement part of the Park Code but we also act as other eyes and ears. When there's a maintenance problem in the middle of the night, like there's a pipe broken in a park or the sprinkler is shooting up water, you can call us and we can figure out how to turn it off or find a way to do it. If a tree falls down or something like



that—because half the time the police will end up calling us anyway but we would like to hear from you guys and have your constituents call us directly so we can address the problems so it's not just enforcement only. Like I said at nighttime we are kind of the eyes and ears for the whole Department when the maintenance Department goes away. So we're dealing with the trees when the trees go down, we're dealing with vehicle—trees on vehicles, somebody gets a tree branch on their car we go out and we take the report, we make sure that we get all the information that goes to the City Attorney for when they need to make the claim. So there was a lot of different things and aspects of what we do other than just the enforcement portion. I just wanted to make sure you guys knew that.

And if you want us at one of your community meeting just let us know. You can call me, call Marcus, we'll be there. If we can't be there, a Sergeant will be there. We'll have someone there.

**Chair:** Are there any other questions from the committee? Gentlemen, thank you very much. I think the best piece that we heard from you was about being present in our communities because aside from the uniform getting to know the community is really going to be beneficial, I think you are really going to be able to figure out the real supportive people and the not supportive people and that will help you to really make sense of each park.

**Mike Celeste:** And we hope we hear in six months to a year that we do you see you out there, we see your guys out there, you called, you responded. That's what I want to hear. That's my goal.

**Chair:** So there is no public comment on this item so this item is closed. I have just two quick things. Before I get into any announcements anybody have any announcements?

**Richard Rothman:** If everything goes as planned when you go to McLaren Lodge after January 18<sup>th</sup> there will be more discussions on the photo show of Mother's Building murals on display in the lobby there so you'll get to see what Dawn, Stacy and myself have been talking about if you haven't been in the building. It's going to be from the 19<sup>th</sup> through March 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**Maya Rodgers:** [unintelligible]

**Chair:** Anybody else? The only item that I'm going to direct you to talk about and think about on your own before our next meeting as many of you know we've been watching the GGNRA with regards to its policies on off leash dogs. As many of you may have read in the Chronicle today the GGNRA although fully empowered through the adopted policies of the EIR has not implemented this new policy. What does that mean? Well, it means that they're going to take a wait and see attitude it looks like. There is nothing out there from a dog etiquette perspective that basically people have cried and screamed and yelled and I have to remind them that it's being going on since 2002 and it's finally to where it is today. But as of the 9<sup>th</sup> of January they could have implemented it and they didn't. And so they are saying there is no plan for implementation. There is no timeline for implementation so what that means is that our parks for today may be a little less—I'm much more concerned about what a year from now might look like under that plan because obviously we don't have enough DPAs and there are going to

be issues with increased use through our park system. But for today the news says no implementation of that policy yes.

**Richard Rothman:** On their official release they said the reason they weren't implementing it is because apparently there was a lawsuit for some emails and apparently one of the employees was sending out emails on their private email account and they didn't know about it but apparently they are cooperating so they're getting those emails that people requested. [unintelligible].

**Chair:** The Senators and Congress people have dove into [unintelligible] hugely responsible for that. So I think that benefits us as a community, as people who are going to deal with it. I would certainly want to hear back from them hopefully within three months. We did have a good presentation with them where they said nothing bad would happen. We'll see.

Any other announcements? Hearing none, meeting is adjourned.

**End of Document**